



Client Matter No. 80168.0239
Express Mail No.: EV330613420US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No. 10/021,016	Confirmation No.: 8774
Application of: Alexandre Drobychev, James Kong, Nirupama Mallavarupu, Ching-Wen Chu	Customer No.: 32658
Filed: December 19, 2001	
Art Unit: 2192	
Examiner: Vo, Ted T.	
Attorney Docket No. P5794	
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCE SOFTWARE APPLICATIONS	

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL

MAIL STOP RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:


The undersigned hereby certifies that the following documents:

1. Request for Continued Examination with \$790 fee;
2. Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form;
3. Certificate of Mailing by Express Mail; and
4. Return postcard

relating to the above application, were deposited as "Express Mail", Mailing Label No. EV330613420US with the United States Postal Service, addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 1 Sept 2005.

1 September 2005


Date



Mailer

31 August 2005

Date



Michael C. Martensen, Reg. No. 46,901
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5910 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax



PTOL-413A (08-03)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid. OMB control number.

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application Number: 10/021,016

First Named Applicant: Alexandre Drobichev et al.

Examiner: Vo, Ted T.

Art Unit: 2192 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:(1) Michael C. Martensen

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: September 15, 2005 Proposed Time: 1:00 PM (AM/PM)**Type of Interview Requested:**(1) Telephonic (2) Personal (3) Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: YES NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>CFR 1.56 rejection</u>	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection</u>	<u>1-16, 18-26, 29-32</u>	<u>Kapczynski et al.</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

 Continuation Sheet Attached**Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**

The distinction between importing and analyzing log files as disclosed in Kapczynski and maintaining permanent and session application data as claimed. Further, the platform independent nature of the Applicant's invention.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

Note:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP §713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)